



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,514	11/14/2003	Sohrab Amirghodsi	07844-597001 / P550	9827

21876 7590 03/20/2007  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
P.O. Box 1022  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
----------

CHU, RANDOLPH I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/714,514	<b>Applicant(s)</b> AMIRGHODSI, SOHRAB	
	<b>Examiner</b> Randolph Chu	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/20/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5, 18 23, 26-29, 42, 43, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000).

With respect to claim 1, Blinn et al. teaches computing a filter for applying to the first image, including computing a spatially quantized representation (original wave form is shifted by  $\epsilon$ ) of the filter wherein a degree of spatial quantization of the filter depends on factors including a measure of scale (rescale factor) relating the first sample grid and a desired sample grid (Fig. 3, para. [0040] - [0042]).

With respect to claim 2, Blinn et al. teaches computing a desired image sampled on the desired sample grid, including computing samples of the desired image

according to an application of the spatially quantized representation of the filter to the first image. (Fig. 3, para. [0043]).

With respect to claim 3, Blinn et al. teaches accepting data characterizing a geometric transformation relating the first sample grid and the desired sample grid; and computing the measure of scale from the data characterizing the geometric transformation (Fig. 3, para. [0040]).

With respect to claim 4, Blinn et al. teaches computing the filter includes selecting the number of spatial samples of the spatially quantized representation of the filter (Fig. 3, para. [0043]).

With respect to claim 5, Blinn et al. teaches computing the spatially quantized representation of the filter includes computing values of the filter each associated with one of a number of equal spatial domains of the filter (Fig. 3, para. [0043]).

With respect to claim 18, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

With respect to claim 23, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

With respect to claim 26, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 27, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

With respect to claim 28, please refer to rejection for claim 4.

With respect to claim 29, please refer to rejection for claim 5.

With respect to claim 42, please refer to rejection for claim 1.

With respect to claim 43, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

With respect to claim 44, please refer to rejection for claim 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-8, 19 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000) in view of Thompson (US 6,681,059).

With respect to claim 6, Blinn et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claim 6 respectively depend.

Blinn et al. does not disclose expressly that computing the filter for applying to the first image includes selecting a parametric family of filters.

Thompson teaches computing the filter for applying to the first image includes selecting a parametric family of filters (Figure 8, ref. no. 64; col. 6 lines 50-59).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to select parameters to compute filters and apply it in the method of Blinn et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that filter can be calculated according to the parameter so that filter can be object specific.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Thompson with Blinn et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

With respect to claim 7, Thompson teaches computing the filter for applying to the first image includes determining parameter values for the filter (Figure 8, ref. no. 64; col. 6 lines 50-59).

With respect to claim 8, Thompson teaches determining the parameter values for the filter includes computing the parameters values based on factors including the measure of scale (Figure 8, ref. no. 64; col. 6 lines 50-59).

With respect to claim 19, please refer to rejection for claim 6.

With respect to claim 30, please refer to rejection for claim 6.

With respect to claim 31, please refer to rejection for claim 7.

With respect to claim 32, please refer to rejection for claim 8.

Art Unit: 2624

5. Claims 9-11, 24, 33-35, 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000) in view of Mutoh (US 2004/0057634).

With respect to claim 6, Blinn et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claim 6 respectively depend.

Blinn et al. does not disclose expressly that accepting a user input specifying a characteristic of the resampling.

Mutoh teaches accepting a user input specifying a characteristic of the resampling (para. [0080]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to accept a user input specifying a characteristic of the resampling in the method of Blinn et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that filter can be calculated according to the user input so that filter can be customizable by user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mutoh with Blinn et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

With respect to claim 10, Mutoh teaches accepting the user input includes accepting an input related to a characteristic (Magnification or reduction) of the desired image (para. [0080]).

With respect to claim 11, Mutoh teaches characteristic of the desired image includes a visual characteristic (Magnification or reduction) of the desired image (para. [0080]).

With respect to claim 24, please refer to rejection for claim 11.

With respect to claim 33, please refer to rejection for claim 9.

With respect to claim 34, please refer to rejection for claim 10.

With respect to claim 35, please refer to rejection for claim 11.

With respect to claim 45, please refer to rejection for claim 9.

With respect to claim 46, please refer to rejection for claim 9.

6. Claims 12-13 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000) in view of Mutoh (US 2004/0057634) and in further view of Chiba et al. (US 6,111,566).

With respect to claim 12, Blinn et al. and Mutoh teaches all the limitations of claim 9 as applied above from which claim 12 respectively depend.

Blinn et al. does not disclose expressly that accepting a user input includes accepting an input related to a processing characteristic.

Chiba et al. teaches accepting a user input includes accepting an input related to a processing characteristic (col. 4 lines 18-25).



At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to accept a user input related to a processing characteristic in the method of Blinn et al. and Mutoh

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that user can select choice between image quality and processing characteristic such as speed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiba et al. with Blinn et al. and Mutoh to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

With respect to claim 13, Chiba et al. teaches that input related to the processing characteristic includes an input related to a processing speed (col. 4 lines 18-25).

With respect to claim 36, please refer to rejection for claim 12.

With respect to claim 37, please refer to rejection for claim 13.

7. Claims 14-16 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000).

With respect to claims 14 and 15, Blinn et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 1 as applied above from which claims 14 and 15 respectively depend.

Blinn et al. does not disclose expressly that the degree of spatial quantization of the filter depends on factors that further include characteristics of a computation device include a memory size or cache memory size for performing the resampling.

When a software is made, it always depend on characteristics of a computation device include a memory size. It should have minimum system requirement.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to create filter depend on characteristics of a computation device in the method of Blinn et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that filter can be calculated according characteristics of a computation device so that image processing can be done without conflict with computation device.

With respect to claims 38-40 please refer to rejection for claims 14 -16.

8. Claims 17 and 41 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000) in view of Lacroix et al. (US 2003/0058216).

With respect to claims 17, Blinn et al. teaches all the limitations of claim 14 as applied above from which claims 17 respectively depend.

Blinn et al. does not disclose expressly that the characteristics of the computational device include a processor characteristic.

Lacroix et al. teaches the characteristics of the computational device include a processor characteristic (para [0049]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to create filter depend on processor characteristic of device in the method of Blinn et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that filter can be optimized for user (processing speed, image quality).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chiba et al. with Blinn et al. and Mutoh to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

With respect to claims 41, please refer to rejection for claim 17.

9. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000) in view of Mutoh (US 2004/0057634) and in further view of Blumberg (US 6,886,034).

With respect to claim 20, Blinn et al. and Mutoh teaches all the limitations of claim 19 as applied above from which claim 20 respectively depend.

Blinn et al. and Mutoh does not teach expressly that specification of the geometric transformation includes a specification of an affine transformation.

Blumberg teaches affine transformation (col 10, lines 3-11).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use affine transformation in the method of Blinn et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that affine transformation precisely map straight lines to straight lines and it preserves all linear combination.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Blumberg with Blinn et al. and Mutoh to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

With respect to claim 21, Blumberg teaches, scaling includes a specification of a minification (col. 1 lines 25-31).

With respect to claim 22, Blumberg teaches, scaling includes a specification of a magnification (col. 1 lines 25-31).

10. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al. (US 2003/0077000) in view of Mutoh (US 2004/0057634) and in further view of Li et al. (US 6,181,834).

With respect to claim 25, Blinn et al. and Mutoh teaches all the limitations of claim 23 as applied above from which claim 25 respectively depend.

Blinn et al. and Mutoh does not teach expressly that the visual characteristic is related to a degree of sharpness.

Li et al. teaches the visual characteristic is related to a degree of sharpness (col. 7 line 65 – col line 32).

Art Unit: 2624

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to accept a user input specifying degree of sharpness in the method of Blinn et al. and Mutoh

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been that user can flexibly control of moire suppression vs. image sharpness.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Li et al. with Mutoh and Blinn et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randolph Chu whose telephone number is 571-270-1145. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Mancuso can be reached on 571-272-7695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

Art Unit: 2624

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RIC/



JOSEPH MANCUSO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER